

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on February 28, 2003, has been received and reviewed.

Claims 1-73 were previously pending in the above-referenced application.

Claims 1-9, 23, 36, 38-58, and 73 have been withdrawn from consideration. Of these, claims 1-9 and 38-58 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 23, 36, and 73 have been withdrawn pursuant to an election of species requirement and, therefore, may eventually be brought back into consideration in the above-referenced application.

Claims 10-22, 25-35, and 59-62 stand rejected.

The indication that claims 63-72 recite allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation.

New claims 74-83 have been added.

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

Drawing Objection Under 37 CFR § 1.83(a)

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for purportedly not showing each and every feature recited in the currently-pending claims of the above-referenced application. Specifically, the drawings were objected to for not depicting either a polymeric film or a routing element.

The routing element is identified in the specification and drawings of the above-referenced application by reference number 40. As indicated in paragraph [0027], routing element 40 may comprise a nonconductive polymer, and be in the form of a flexible, substantially planar member. The routing elements and polymeric films thereof are shown by themselves, for example, in FIGs. 1 and 2, as well as on substrates, in FIGs. 7-10.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 10-22, 24-35, 37, and 60-62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

In particular, claims 10-22, 24-35, and 37 were rejected because the Office could not locate where the polymeric film is shown. As noted above, the polymeric film is shown, for example, in FIGs. 1 and 2, as well as in FIGs. 7-10.

In addition, claims 11-13 and 60-62 were rejected on the basis that it is unclear how the polymeric film or routing element could be superimposed over a semiconductor device. An example of this arrangement is shown in the lower left section of FIG. 7. Another example is shown in the center of FIG. 8.

For these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections of claims 10-22, 24-35, 37, and 60-62 be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 10, 25, and 59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,462,976 to Olejniczak et al. (hereinafter "Olejniczak").

M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Olejniczak teaches, among other things, substrates that have polymeric layers laminated thereon. *See, e.g.*, FIGs. 15A-20. At least some of the polymeric layers carry conductive structures, including conductive traces. As indicated at col. 24, line 33, to col. 25, line 17, each

polymeric layer is formed over the semiconductor substrate and, therefore, is not separate therefrom.

Independent claim 10, as amended and presented herein, recites a semiconductor device assembly that includes a substrate, at least one semiconductor device secured to the substrate, and a polymeric film, which is separate from the substrate, positioned at least partially over at least one of the substrate and the at least one semiconductor device.

Independent claim 25, as amended and presented herein, recites a carrier for at least one semiconductor device. The carrier of amended independent claim 25 includes a substrate and a polymeric film. The polymeric film is separate from and positioned at least partially over the substrate.

Independent claim 59, as amended and presented herein, recites a semiconductor device assembly that includes a substrate, a routing element, and at least one semiconductor device. The routing element of amended independent claim 59 is separate from and positioned at least partially on the substrate.

As Oleginickzak lacks any teaching or suggestion that the laminated polymeric layers thereof may be separate from a substrate, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 10, 25, and 59 are each allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Accordingly withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 10, 25, and 59 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The indication that claims 63-72 recite allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation. New claims 74-83 have been added so that each allowable claim is now either in independent form or depends from a claim which is now allowable. New claims 74-83 recite substantially the same subject as that to which claims 63-67, 70, 68, 69, 71, and 72 are respectively drawn.

Election of Species Requirement

As independent claims 10, 25, and 59 are now allowable and remain generic to each of Species I-V, and since claims 23, 36, and 73 depend from claims 10, 25, and 59, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of each of claims 23, 36, and 73 should be considered by the Office and that each of these claims should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that each of claims 10-37 and 59-83 is allowable. An early notice of the allowability of these claims, as well as an indication that the above-referenced application has been passed for issuance, are respectfully solicited. If any issues preventing allowance of the above-referenced application remain which might be resolved by way of a telephone conference, the Office is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Brick G. Power
Registration No. 38,581
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TRASKBRITT, PC
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: May 28, 2003

BGP/ps:djp
Document in ProLaw